

Response to Advisory Action Mailed February 4, 2008

A. Claims In The Case

Claims 1-3 have been rejected. Claims 1-3 are pending in the case.

B. Objections to Drawings

Applicant has submitted substitute drawings in response to the Office Action mailed November 8, 2007 and believes that this matter has been resolved to the satisfaction of the Examiner.

C. The Claims Are Not Indefinite Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicant has amended claim 1 for clarity in response to the Office Action mailed November 8, 2007 and believes that this matter has been resolved to the satisfaction of the Examiner.

D. The Claims Are Not Obvious Over The Cited Art Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,452,407 to Khoury ("Khoury"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

Claim 1 describes a combination of features including but not limited to the following features:

a connection terminal part integrally formed and connected to a substrate;

a probe support portion; and

a contact part, the contact part comprising

an edge part having a tapered end configuration; and

a contact support part which supports the edge part and couples the edge part to the probe support part,

wherein the contact part extends from the probe support part, and wherein the edge part has a sectional configuration which shares a side face with the contact support part and wherein the edge part has a thickness that is less than the thickness of the contact support part, and wherein the distance the edge part extends from the contact support part along the shared face is different than the distance the edge part extends from the contact support part along an opposite face.

Applicant's claims are directed to a modified probe. Turning to Fig. 1, a schematic of Applicant's probe is depicted. Probe includes a contact part (5) and a probe supporting part (2). Contact part (5) includes a contact support part (10, See Fig. 2) and an edge part (9). As can be seen in the figures, edge part (9) has a thickness that is less than the thickness of the contact support part. Edge part (9) extends a predetermined distance from contact support part (10) along the bottom face (as depicted in Fig. 2). As further depicted, however, edge part (9) does not extend the same distance from contact support part (10). In fact, in the depicted embodiment, edge part (9) does not extend from the contact support part (10) to any significant extent.

As noted in the specification, such a configuration is different from prior art contact parts. For example, Figures 6 and 7 depict commonly used prior art contact parts. Many prior art contact parts include either a pyramidal contact part (Fig. 6A) or a conical contact part (Fig. 6B). Khoury appears to teach the use of a pyramidal contact part, similar to the contact part depicted in Fig. 6A. Specifically, referring to Fig. 11B of Khoury, a top view of contact part "e" is depicted. It appears from this representation, that contact part "e" has a square pyramidal shape

to it, similar to the square pyramidal; shape shown in the prior art contact part of Fig. 6A. With respect to any of the faces, the contact part of Khoury appears to extend the same distance from the supporting part.

In contrast, Applicant's claims are directed to a contact part which includes an edge part and a contact support part. The edge part extends from the contact support part and has at least one side face that is shared with the contact support part. See for example, the side view representations depicted in Figure 2, the bottom part of Figure 3, and the left bottom part of Figure 4. The distance the edge part extends from the contact support part along the shared face is different than the distance the edge part extends from the contact support part along the opposite face. Khoury does not appear to teach or suggest a contact part having this configuration, nor would it be obvious from the teachings of Khoury to modify the contact part described in Khoury to have the configuration described in Applicant's claims and depicted in Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Applicant submits, therefore, that the combination of features of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Khoury, nor would they be obvious in view of Khoury. Applicant further submits that claims 2 and 3 are patentable over Khoury for at least the same reasons' cited above.

E. Summary

Based on the above, Applicant submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Tetsuji Ueno
10/553,064

Applicant respectfully requests a one-month extension of time to respond to the Office Action dated November 8, 2007. A fee authorization form in the amount of \$120.00 is enclosed for the extension of time fee. If any further extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5682-00800/EBM

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark R. DeLuca/

Mark R. DeLuca
Reg. No. 44,649

Patent Agent for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: March 9, 2008